Human Events THE WASHINGTON NEWSLETTER

THE LIBRARY WISCONSIN STATE COLLEGE RIVER FALLS, WISCONSIN

Vol. XVII, No. 27 July 7, 1960 Section 1 — News

DEMOCRATS: *Family of Strangers* .....(261)

CONGRESS: *Special "spending session?"* .....(262)

GOVERNMENT: *Hidden policy makers* .....(263)

CALIFORNIA: *Reds active as Democrats* ....(263)

FOREIGN AID: *Lavish program scored* .....(264)

Democratic Disarray: The Donnybrook predicted for next week at the Democratic convention in Los Angeles has already started, and Capital wags are saying a blood donor program, hospital rooms and all, will be a feature in the convention hall in the City of the Angels.

All joking aside, Senator Lyndon Johnson has sharpened the conflict among Democrats by his dramatic decision to recess, instead of to adjourn, the Congress until August, obviously to enable him to strengthen his following for the nomination next week. He has a formidable club—his power as Senate leader to force passage of many bills now held over until August. A lot of delegates want those bills and may think twice before opposing the Texan's ambition. Sometimes what happens the week before the convention proves decisive. Anyway, Johnson is trying.

But not without emotion. To a friendly colleague in the Senate, Johnson—HUMAN EVENTS learns—expressed anger and frustration at "the money power against me." If he loses, he won't be happy.

Meanwhile, Capital observers are studying contusions among Democratic ranks as a result of recent things done and said, and there reigns much speculation as to whether the wounds can be healed before the voters go to the polls in November. Discounting the soaring hopes of sardonic GOP observers, the following episodes deserve thought in appraising the nomination and the election campaign to follow:

(1) Too little noticed in the Northern press was the fact that Senator Harry F. Byrd (D.-Va.) defied Democratic Chairman Paul Butler's demand for a personal loyalty pledge to be signed by delegates before they can take their seats. The usually placid Virginia Senator bluntly said, "I won't sign any oath" and this demand will "irritate Southern delegations." Byrd's words carry weight in Dixie, where there rise threats "to bolt the party" if Johnson (the Southern favorite) isn't nominated.

Senator Kennedy's stock in Dixie, which has declined conspicuously in recent months, slumped badly following his speech to the "Liberal" party in New York. The Massachusetts man reportedly expressed

POLITICAL CLUBS! Make money selling HUMAN EVENTS subscriptions—a hot-selling item during the Presidential campaign. Write for details.

the hope that he could win the nomination without a single Southern vote in the convention. When the rebel yells greeting this utterance had subsided, the "Profiles of Courage" man sought to explain it away and said he sought votes from the South.

(2) The "Liberal" party is center of a left-wing enclave in New York, which claims—not without reason—that it can swing elections. This leftist element—including the far-left New York *Post*, Governor Herbert Lehman, Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt, David Dubinsky—is the base of the extraordinary vociferousness of the drive for Adlai Stevenson for the nomination. Leftist politicos privately concede that Adlai has no chance. But the drive for him conceals one crucial bargaining demand—a pledge by Kennedy to make the well-known apostle of appeasement of Russia the next Secretary of State.

Kennedy reportedly has been trying to make a deal—a promise to let Adlai run our foreign policy —in return for Stevenson delegate support for the nomination. Haggling has been going on, and no little arm-twisting by Mrs. Roosevelt. It's possible that Kennedy, despite his eagerness to get those Stevenson delegates, broods over the clobbering he would get (if nominated) by the GOP, for promising to make Appeasement Adlai the shaper of American foreign policy.

(3) But the searing, cannon-cracker explosion in Democratic ranks came when Chairman Butler publicly suggested that Catholic Democrats might turn against the party unless it nominates Kennedy. Butler is a Catholic and is in Kennedy's corner. He was challenged by Congressman Hale Boggs (D.-La.), highly respected and prominent in the party, also a Catholic. Boggs called Butler's statement "frightening" and "false." Going on, Boggs emphasized that Butler "is not contributing to the solution of these problems or the abatement of these prejudices, but may be assuring a new wave of hatred and misunderstanding."

Additionally, Governor Lawrence of Pennsylvania, perhaps the key man in the nomination scramble, had this to say (on the June 26 Face the Nation telecast) about Butler's warning: "Well, as a member of the Catholic Church, I resent . . . the statement recently made by Mr. Butler on that subject."

The question now burns: "How many Catholics are cooling on Kennedy because of the Butler type of talk?"

Copyright 1960 by HUMAN EVENTS

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Special Session: What may happen when Congress comes back to Washington in August bodes no good for the taxpayer, according to conservative members. Senator Frank J. Lausche (D.-Ohio) told the Senate there might be an unhealthy "bidding for votes" in the form of new legislation. As time wore on and the election drew nearer, he said, "the price" might go up and up. And Senator John M. Butler (R.-Md.) added the recess was "going to cost somebody an awful lot of money and I have a good idea it's going to be the American taxpayer."

On the other hand, other Senators said it all depends on who wins the Democratic Presidential nomination. "If it's Lyndon, he'll put on quite a show, bidding for votes. And the congressional spot he'll occupy in the public prints will aid his efforts," said one colleague. "But"—he added—"if he loses and Kennedy wins, Lyndon may be sore and close up the session early, to no advantage to his party."

Rockefeller: Nelson Rockefeller's haymakers aimed at Nixon and the Administration during the Montana Governor's conference now have Rocky squarely pegged in top Republican circles as the "GOP's Judas," rather than a constructive critic. Increasingly, word from the party's high command is that not only has Nelson destroyed his 1960 political fortunes, but his continued "sour grapes" attacks may well doom him as future Presidential timber.

North Dakota: The down to the wire North Dakota Senate race for the unexpired term of the late Republican William Langer has been termed a bad omen for GOP Prairie State area candidates this fall and a signal that much effort will be needed to pull through in crucial contests.

Democrats, attempting to win with "liberal" Congressman Quentin Burdick over Governor John W. Davis, used Agriculture Secretary Benson as a "whipping boy" throughout the campaign, and Republicans anticipate like tactics throughout the fall campaign.

Even if an expected recount of the hair-line contest should surprisingly result in election of Davis, directors of GOP strategy in Washington recognize that the "Beat Benson" tide holds a great danger for their party's success in November.

"Me Too" Declaration: Senator Barry Goldwater last week articulated the reaction of conservative Republicans to a nine-point "declaration of purpose" circulated among GOP Senators by George Aiken of Vermont. It was described by New York's "progressive" Senator Javits as a "forward looking" manifesto. Senator Aiken's stated purpose was to affect this year's GOP platform.

In an interview with Washington broadcaster Martha Rountree, Goldwater criticized the "liberal" proposals by stating: "When we get into the proposition that the Republican party should espouse the welfare state, then it's my feeling we have adopted the same program that we so vigorously fought through the 1930's and 1940's."

Noting that the Republicans who signed the declaration (and who last year attempted to name Senator Kuchel minority leader over Senator Dirksen) were for heavy spending, the Arizonan added: "I think it is incumbent upon them to tell the American people how many billion dollars Federal aid to education, Federal aid to the aged, Federal aid to everybody, is going to cost . . . . You've heard every [Democratic nomination] candidate espousing these identical things."

Cost of Snake Dancing: General Arthur Trudeau, Chief of US Army Research and Development, in his address June 28 to the Junior Chamber of Commerce in Washington, related information he received from a prominent Japanese businessman concerning Red subsidization of the snake-dance rioting students in Tokyo:

The Communists spent at least 200 million yen (about $560,000), plus some substantial funds brought in through Hong Kong. Students were seen receiving notes from 300 to 1000 yen. The approximately $560,000 came from Soviet trading company balances built up by sale of lacquer and chestnuts, plus income from theatrical tours of Red Chinese plays and Russian Bolshoi ballet performances.

Lieutenant General Trudeau, besides heading Army Research and Development, formerly had a command in Korea and a few years back served as Chief of Army Intelligence.

Capitol Camera: For Lyndon Johnson—13; for Kennedy—11; for Stevenson—3; for Symington—1; no choice—2. Thus, a poll by the Cincinnati *Enquirer* correspondent of the Democratic Governors at the Glacier Park, Montana, conference.

• *That West Virginia primary ended in May, with 6 delegates pledged to Kennedy. But, since then, the Massachusetts Senator has reportedly picked up 10 more.*

• Lyndon Johnson, in private arguments with "liberal" Democratic colleagues, turns the table on them. When they profess to be indifferent whether the South bolts or not, he retorts: "Well, if you Northerners want to bolt the Old Party, go ahead; we in the South will keep the Democratic party going."

• *Diplomatic Row reports Western European governments fear a Democratic party victory, when Appeasement Adlai would become Secretary of State. Should that happen, they have plans for a closer European confederation, under French-German leadership, as a Third World Force. With Stevenson, they expect the US would cease to lead the free world forces against communism.*

• How to improve US-Japan relations: Representatives Gerald Ford (R.-Mich.) and Frank Kowalski (D.-Conn.) have asked Ike to send General Douglas MacArthur back to Japan for a visit.

• *A former law clerk for Earl Warren, now a law professor in Berkeley, California, has been telling*

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

his students that the House Un-American Activities Committee is unconstitutional and should be abolished.

• Chester Bowles, Chairman of the Democratic Platform Committee, has refused to side with fellow Democrats who have petitioned both party platform committees urging non-recognition of Red China; prominent among the petitioning Democrats is House Floor Leader John McCormack.

• *The American Committee for Protection of the Foreign Born has been ordered by the Subversive Activities Control Board to register as a Communist-Front organization. The ACPFB has been demanding drastic revision of our immigration law, which provides for deportation of alien Communists.*

• W. E. B. Dubois, leading American Negro journalist who regularly contributes to the *Nation* and has spread anti-US propaganda among the Africans, was recently awarded the Lenin Peace Prize.

• *Prime Minister Jawaharlal "I never learn" Nehru recently praised the Russians for their efforts at the disarmament conference in Geneva. Two days later the Russians walked out.*

• In the GOP district of Beverly Hills, California, Vice President Nixon ran behind the party vote in the recent primary. Party precinct workers say many conservatives refused to vote for Nixon and wrote in Barry Goldwater's name (even while realizing write-ins were not legal).

• *Tom Dewey finds himself in a touchy spot regarding the GOP convention, because he reportedly favors Nixon but doesn't care to offend old friend Nelson Rockefeller. Dewey will therefore travel to Europe for "business appointments," missing his first Republican convention in* 20 *years.*

Fifth Column in Government: On foreign policy, Ike—in his speech of June 27—has rectified the distorted picture given by many papers about his "humiliation" in the Far East, and Nixon has set an aggressive political course for re-election. That course has put the Democrats on the spot, as the party favored by Khrushchev. Adlai Stevenson's demand that the Russian dictator be kept out of the campaign forensics has aroused much mirth within GOP circles. However, within the Administration bureaucracy there appear signs that the Republican Administration does not get collaboration in its planned march towards victory in November.

Last week, the Chicago *Tribune* revealed that the Voice of America was treating a major Administration policy as "campaign oratory" and spreading this impression on the air waves abroad. The Voice told its large audience that Vice President Nixon's food surplus disposal plan had political connotations, and warned against expectations of early realization of Nixon's proposal to "bring hungry people and surplus food together." The broadcast said Nixon's plan was not "official," although his proposal was originally set up for announcement by Ike at the summit conference. On the other hand, the Voice contrasted the Nixon plan with the more imaginative plan of this nature by Senator John F. Kennedy.

One of the frequent criticisms of the Eisenhower Administration is that it has never cleaned out the Truman-Acheson holdovers in the bureaucracy and has never formed a faithful team for executing its policies. The Voice of America incident comes on top of the reports that Ambassador Douglas MacArthur II in Tokyo persuaded the Japanese Premier to "dis-invite" President Eisenhower—a move not pleasing to Ike at all. MacArthur is a son-in-law of the late Senator Barkley, Democratic Vice President and party wheel-horse.

Constantine Brown, long-time foreign editor of the Washington *Evening Star*, recently wrote of the "hidden policy-makers" in the bureaucracy, particularly of the State Department, saying that "their policies may come out as the work of the Secretary of State, but actually he is sometimes merely a front behind which are the hidden policy-makers." Not only the State Department bureaucrats but also those of the Central Intelligence Agency are blamed for the US policy which let Castro seize power in Cuba.

California Reds: While student disturbances grabbed the headlines at the recent House Un-American Activities Committee hearings in San Francisco, a provocative tale of Communist infiltration of the California Democratic party was overlooked.

Testifying before the committee May 14-15 was a building contractor who admitted to 26 years of Communist party membership (he defected in August, 1959). He testified that in 1956, after the voters rejected the Independent Progressive party (cited as a Red front in 1955 by the California Senate Committee on Un-American Activities), a directive was sent to party members stating that "all members of the Communist party should infiltrate and become active in the [1958] election campaign of the Democratic party. At that particular time, the Right to Work was a major issue the Communists had latched onto and the major motivation they had in this campaign was to defeat Senator Knowland and the Right to Work act. They worked diligently in the precincts as Democrats, went from house to house in their effort to defeat Senator Knowland and assure a Democratic victory."

He also testified that, aside from his home area of Los Altos, "There is every indication that there has been similar infiltration [of the Democratic party] throughout the State of California."

The witness stated that at the 1956 Fresno convention of Democratic clubs five Communists from his area were present. He said Red infiltration was so successful that at one time the South Palo Alto Democratic Club had 14 Communists out of a membership of 25. The witness said the first big

HON. HOWARD W. ROBISON (R.-N. Y.), US Representative: "During my three years in Congress, I have continually found the peek at the news behind the news afforded by HUMAN EVENTS not only factual and informative, but fascinating as well."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

push for Communist membership in the California Democratic party came in 1952.

Of the Red attitude toward the HUAC, he testified: "At all times one of the major targets, and at this time, of course, the major target of the Communist party, is their intense, fervent desire to abolish the Committee on Un-American Activities because the committee, they feel, is the biggest stumbling block that they have at this time in their effort to break out in a full fledged Communist operation . . . . "

Nixon: The official Soviet radio, beamed to the homeland as well as Europe, Africa and Asia, continues to blast Vice President Nixon almost daily.

Nixon is labelled a "tool of the oil kings," a "McCarthyite" and a warmonger. He is described as the architect of US espionage in the Soviet Union, and much credence is given to a unique theory of Senator Jack Kennedy's:

"As was pointed out by Senator Kennedy, a candidate for the Democratic Party's Presidential nomination, Eisenhower could only have expressed his regret to Khrushchev about the U-2 incident, but he could not have satisfied the Soviet Premier's demand to punish the persons responsible because that would have meant Vice President Nixon, first and foremost."

The standard left-wing attacks upon Nixon as a "cheap politician" are regularly broadcast. The captive audience of Radio Moscow is often told of Nixon's $18,235 "slush fund" in 1952 and his "below-the-belt" attacks on the Democratic opposition.

Mrs. Cyrus Eaton: Ohio Governor Mike DiSalle, a leading backer of Senator Jack Kennedy for the Democratic Presidential nomination, has beaten down an attempt by key Buckeye State Democrats to purge Mrs. Cyrus Eaton from the state's delegation to the party's national convention.

Cleveland Democratic chieftains Ray T. Miller and Albert S. Porter—who control ten of the state's 51 convention votes—protested Mrs. Eaton's status following her latest trip behind the Iron Curtain. Travelling with her millionaire husband, Mrs. Eaton conferred with top Red leaders, including Nikita Khrushchev. She regularly attacked the US, while lauding the Soviet "peace race."

Democrats Miller and Porter first asked Mrs. Eaton to resign as convention delegate so as to save the party national embarrassment. Mrs. Eaton refused and was promptly defended by County Democratic Chairman E. E. Leonard, who crowed:

"I think she'll be a hell of a good delegate and will draw national attention."

Miller and Porter then appealed directly to DiSalle, but the pudgy chief executive praised Mrs. Eaton as a loyal Democrat and declared she would remain in the delegation.

Declaring the issue a "moral and ethical one," Miller and Porter are considering an objection at Los Angeles. In a telephone interview with HUMAN EVENTS, however, Porter admitted the chances were slim that the Credentials Committee would unseat Mrs. Eaton.

Foreign Aid: While the Administration was telling Congress the necessity for a $4 billion foreign aid program last week, the Senate Appropriations Committee heard a devastating attack upon the program by Walter Harnischfeger.

Harnischfeger is chairman of the Citizens Foreign Aid Committee, composed of such distinguished members as General Albert C. Wedemeyer and Spruille Braden.

Harnischfeger declared that "our lavish foreign aid" has "not arrested communism." In fact, he said, it has grown in Cuba, Bolivia, Venezuela, Laos, Cambodia, South Vietnam, Japan and South Korea, where we have given large amounts of aid. He said while the US has poured money into Bolivia, the latter has nationalized its mines, confiscated the property of the people, and turned communistic. The $167 million now being given, he said, is used to support "a few American and Bolivian politicians."

Harnischfeger said that a balanced budget is a key to a sound economy, but under the program our budgets are unbalanced and we have run a balance of payments deficit nine out of the last 10 *years.*

He warned Congress that "the effect of all the international banks and lending institutions" is to "transfer enormous financial power to Washington and monopolize capital control in the hands of a relatively few people who operate in an ivory tower, removed from the sources of capital formation." If the present procedure continues, he said, "it will result in a planned international economy with many serious political and social implications. Our freedom will be gone."

Cuba: Intelligence agencies, monitoring the Castro radio, report the regime's anti-Americanism has reached a fever pitch in recent weeks. President Eisenhower, for instance, is ridiculed as "His Majesty, Caesar Atilla Nero Napoleon Chapita Eisenhower I, Emperor of the Imperial White House, Washington, Seat of the Yankee Emperor."

Admiral Arleigh Burke is libeled as " the drunkard with a squadron, the little rascal who wears the stripes of a super rear admiral of His Imperial Majesty." Secretary of State Herter and CIA boss Dulles are regularly attacked as "bloody imperialists," as are such key congressional figures as Dan Flood of Pennsylvania and Styles Bridges of New Hampshire.

TRIAL SUBSCRIPTION: 5 weeks $1. Yearly rate $12.50; 6 months $6.50 3 months $3.50. Second-class postage paid at Washington, D. C.

For change of address send old address EXACTLY AS IT APPEARS on the envelope of your copy of HUMAN EVENTS and new address (with zone number if any). **ALLOW US TWO WEEKS** to process new subscriptions and change of address.

Bound volumes indexed, $15. Only 1955, 1956, 1958, 1959 available.

FRANK C. HANIGHEN, *Editor and Publisher* JAMES L. WICK, *Executive Publisher*
Assistant Editors: JOHN R. BENEDICT GEORGE O. FOWLER
NICHOLAS T. NONNENMACHER ALLAN H. RYSKIND
Editorial Assistants: BARBARA STAMBAUGH VALERIE WEEKS
Business Manager: W. B. HICKS, JR. *Contributing Editor*: FRANK CHODOROV

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Vol. XVII, No. 27
SECTION II

THE LIBRARY
WISCONSIN STATE COLLEGE
RIVER FALLS, WISCONSIN

HUMAN EVENTS
JULY 7, 1960

What ONE Person Can Do!!

Rutherford B. Hayes was elected President by ONE vote in the electoral college.

The count, being challenged, was referred to an electoral commission—where Hayes won by ONE vote.

ONE vote was cast by a Congressman from Indiana who was himself elected by ONE vote.

ONE vote was cast for that Congressman by a close personal friend who got up from his sickbed to go to the polls.

Hayes ran for the Presidency promising to accept only one term. He asserted that the Reconstruction Period, with its terror, could be ended only by a President who need give no consideration to political expediency.

HAYES KEPT HIS PROMISES.

It is entirely possible that YOU—just ONE person—may decide the coming election. How? By MULTIPLYING YOURSELF.

You know dozens of persons who can be stirred into activity if they are supplied with inspiration and ammunition.

Stimulate them to action by giving each of them a 4-months subscription to HUMAN EVENTS. Special price, $3.75 for four months—which carries the subscription through the election.

The articles in HUMAN EVENTS will often be exactly what these persons will buy in large quantities for distribution to their neighbors, friends, associates, employes.

In making up your list of gift subscriptions, consider the following: Persons in your industry, profession, occupation. Your employes.

Your suppliers and customers. They think highly of you and will give serious thought to your suggestions.

Precinct captains.

Officers of your chamber of commerce, civic and service clubs, patriotic organizations, women's organizations.

Political and union leaders.

Teachers.

Unless you specify otherwise, your name will be listed on a gift card accompanying the first issue of HUMAN EVENTS.

Rush your list TODAY. COPE (The AFL-CIO political arm) is already organizing and energizing its force: one million shop stewards and union officials. In a close race, YOUR activity may be decisive. There is NO TIME TO LOSE.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

HUMAN EVENTS 408 First Street, S. E., Washington 3, D. C.

Here is my list. Send the following people subscriptions for the period indicated.

☐ Payment Enclosed ☐ Bill Me ☐ Bill My Company

My Name _____
Address _____
City _____ Zone _____ State _____

Name _____
Address _____
City _____ Zone _____ State _____
☐ Election period—$3.75 ☐ One Year—$12.50

Name _____
Address _____
City _____ Zone _____ State _____
☐ Election period—$3.75 ☐ One Year—$12.50

Name _____
Address _____
City _____ Zone _____ State _____
☐ Election period—$3.75 ☐ One Year—$12.50

Name _____
Address _____
City _____ Zone _____ State _____
☐ Election period—$3.75 ☐ One Year—$12.50

Name _____
Address _____
City _____ Zone _____ State _____
☐ Election period—$3.75 ☐ One Year—$12.50

Name _____
Address _____
City _____ Zone _____ State _____
☐ Election period—$3.75 ☐ One Year—$12.50

Name _____
Address _____
City _____ Zone _____ State _____
☐ Election period—$3.75 ☐ One Year—$12.50

Name _____
Address _____
City _____ Zone _____ State _____
☐ Election period—$3.75 ☐ One Year—$12.50

Name _____
Address _____
City _____ Zone _____ State _____
☐ Election period—$3.75 ☐ One Year—$12.50

Name _____
Address _____
City _____ Zone _____ State _____
☐ Election period—$3.75 ☐ One Year—$12.50

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Vol. XVII, No. 27 — Section III HUMAN EVENTS July 7, 1960

THE LIBRARY WISCONSIN STATE COLLEGE RIVER FALLS, WISCONSIN

The Great Forand Hoax

Part V: Con Man In the White House?

By JAMES L. WICK

Alexander Norman is a member of the "inner circle" of a Liberal Candidate for the Presidency. His political education is described in a series of letters to his brother, Albert. Letters 1 through 11 appeared in June 9, 16, 23 and 30 editions of HUMAN EVENTS. *Letter No. 12 follows.*

Letter No. 12

DEAR ALBERT: I had never heard of Congressman Forand of Rhode Island or the Forand Bill six months ago. I don't suppose you had either. Since I joined this campaign, there are times that I hear little else.

Pat O'Connell, our campaign manager, has to come up once in a while for air. When those opportunities arise, I toss him an innocent question and get a fund of information in reply. Last night my question was:

"Maybe I travel in the wrong circles. But from the way you politicians talk, all the oldsters must be on relief and are not getting medical attention, hospital care, or even food. Professor Calowan-Booth told me yesterday the Republicans haven't a chance this November because of some 16 million oldsters that will be voting as a bloc. When I asked why, he said: 'Oldsters have become conscious of their voting strength. From now on, they will vote their economic necessities.'"

Pat's reply: "I wish I could be that sure, Alex. I will be Postmaster General if Our Candidate wins. I need that Cabinet post as a stepping stone to a $100,000 a year job in business. You know those big defense firms want corporation presidents with an inside track in Washington; after four years as Postmaster General, I would get plenty of such offers."

I said: "You were about to say something about the oldster vote."

"Yes, the Forand strategy was thought up by the lib-labs (Liberal-labor idea men) about a year ago. The lib-labs were worried about the effect of inflation on the old folks' vote. Senior citizens, as they like to be called, save and sacrifice—do without—for 30 or 40 years with the expectation that, let us say, their income of $100 a month will take care of their old age. But when they reach 65, inflation makes $100 a month look like peanuts. What bothered the lib-labs was that the old folks think the Democratic party is their enemy, the Big Spend Party, the Party of Inflation. The oldster vote, they calculated, would be 4-to-1 against us. That was the problem we threw into their laps a year ago. They were told to come up with the solution.

"Well, you know, the big international unions have millions of dollars in dues coming every year. They have Big Brain Boys who have just one assignment: to work out political strategy.

"The Big Brain Boys follow a primary military tactic: attack, attack, attack, always attack. After plenty of cogitating, they came up with the Forand gimmick. Instead of our being on the defensive about inflation, they said we should take the offensive: offer free medical, hospital and nursing home care to the aged. Push the conservatives back up against the wall.

"As the first propaganda weapon, the Big Brains worked out all those statistics you've seen repeated day after day by the Liberal columnists: 60 per cent of the people aged 65 or over have incomes less than $1,000. To see how neat a trick this is, remember that in the case of most couples, all the income is in the man's name; the wife has no income. Right there, 50 per cent of the couple is penniless even if the other 50 per cent may have a very substantial income. Statistics don't lie, but liars sure do know how to use statistics.

"All this material was quietly assembled. The lib-labs got the barrage ready. The command to open fire was given in January. The bombardment caught Congress by surprise. Many members panicked."

I asked: "What about the medical groups? Weren't they on the alert? What have they been doing all these years?"

Pat's reply: "In politics, conservatives are never alert. They are always asleep—until it's too late. Doctors, most of them overworked, are typical conservatives. They pay little or no attention to politics. Came the assault; they never knew what hit 'em."

I asked: "Wasn't there some kind of socialized medicine drive 10 or 15 years ago? Didn't the doctors win that program?"

Replied Pat: "They did. You're thinking of Truman's proposal for a compulsory health program back in '49. Doctors got scared. They really went to work. They talked to their patients. They distributed literature. The Truman program never got off the ground. It didn't even get to a vote in Congress.

"When I look backwards at that episode, the doctors' victory seems incredible. Today you ask: 'How could it have happened?' In '49, only 20 per cent of the people 65 and over had voluntary health insurance while today 65 per cent of the aged have some coverage. Incidentally, by 1965—only five years away—80 per cent of the aged will have private health insurance and the coverage given by the policies is being widened every year. This is our most serious obstacle. The lib-labs will have to work awfully fast in the next three or four years if we are to have a chance. If we haven't won this battle before 1965, we may never win it."

I said: "You say the doctors beat Truman. After that, what happened?"

Answered Pat: "As soon as Ike was elected, the medical associations suspended their educational activities. They said: 'Ike is in; we have nothing to worry about. We've got to stop this agitation about socialized medicine. If we keep on denouncing socialized medicine, putting leaflets in

Copyright 1960 by HUMAN EVENTS

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the doctors' offices, people will read them and start thinking about the subject. If they think, they might think wrong. They might want socialized medicine.'"

Pat paused to order another drink. Then went on:

"I said a few minutes ago that in politics, conservatives are just damned dumb. One of their worst mistakes is to believe that the so-called masses will grab at every something-for-nothing offer that comes along. Let me give one example to show you how wrong they are. From the time Bismarck introduced socialized medicine in Germany in the 1880's, Socialists in this country have been campaigning for it and they haven't yet made the grade. Alex, do you realize what an appalling amount of pressure—maneuvering and manipulating—is needed to get the common people to go for each new social reform?"

I had to admit I did not.

Pat continued: "Let me review for you what we've had to do to get Forandism up to its present stage. If you're familiar with labor publications, you know that the unions fill up every issue of their weekly and monthly organs, 17,000,000 *circulation, with hate propaganda. To the normal diet of hate-businessmen, we got them to add hate for the 'cruel selfish grasping medical profession.' Next we got almost every union local in the entire nation to hold Forand-indoctrination meetings. Labor leaders ordered every union member to write his Congressman demanding passage of the Forand Bill. The union chiefs have made it clear to all locals that anybody who speaks out in union meetings or anywhere else in public in opposition to Forand is to be branded a traitor, a skunk and a fink.*

"Every oldster in the country—the whole 16 million of them—has been our target. We promise him medical, hospital and nursing home care—free for nothing. The amount of free care will have to be held down in the beginning because the principle has to be established. But we tell them that it all will be absolutely and completely free as soon as we have broken down the resistance of the reactionary elements in our society. We also have been trying to get our message through to every young couple saddled with the support of grandma and grandpa.

"In return for their votes—if they will get enough others to vote the same way—we'll have the government take that entire burden off their shoulders. They'll have that much extra money to spend on themselves. Remember, Alex, Liberals have been offering this program since Bismarck's day. I tell you this to make you realize that it is really the hardest job in the world—trying to give the people something for nothing. Sometimes I wonder who's crazy—us or the people."

At that moment Pat was called away so I hunted down the newsman, travelling with Our Candidate, nicknamed Roy the Reactionary by his fellow-correspondents.

I asked: "What is your opinion of the long-term consequences of the Forand Bill? Free medical hospital and nursing home care for the aged! I can't help but feel the strong pull of that slogan. If I had not joined this Presidential campaign tour, if I had stayed at home where I form my opinion mostly by what I read in the newspapers, I feel sure I would now be at least mildly favorable to the Forand Bill."

Replied Roy: "The long term consequences of the Forand Bill will be tragic. Instead of helping the aged, Forandism would be injurious to them—as well as to all those below the retirement age. The fight against socialized medicine is really everybody's fight, not the doctors'.

"First of all, socialized medicine will give us poorer, not better doctors. There's a manpower shortage in every scientific field. Talented young men and women, with ample choice, certainly will not be attracted to a profession where they will be required to spend much of their time filling out government forms to satisfy a bureaucracy checking on how they handle each patient. How can the health of a nation be improved if the caliber of our doctors sharply declines?

"The second consideration: Since the country is desperately short of doctors, the time of doctors should be conserved, not wasted. When you go to a doctor, you don't want him hurried and harassed. You want his thoughtful and undivided attention. When medical care is free—as in England—the doctors' waiting rooms are crowded. If it doesn't cost anything to see a doctor, why not see him? In Britain, lonely people actually go to the doctor's waiting room to gossip with other people there—while waiting to see the doctor to 'talk over' their various aches and pains. When a doctor knows 30, 40, and 60 people are waiting, he must speed up his examination. The patient whose ailment is not visible may get placebos (harmless soda pills) when a careful unhurried diagnosis might disclose need for an operation or an extended series of treatments.

"Doctors are human beings despite the childish belief that they are or ought to be efficiency machines. Doctors have an obligation to spend some time—maybe not very much—with their families. They would appreciate a 40-hour week, if not regularly, at least once in a blue moon.

"As usual, Liberals belittle the costs of this new program. 'Only one-fourth of one per cent cost to the wage earner and the same to his employer, maybe eventually four-fifths of a cent to each.' So they say.

"But Liberals—the sincere ones being people who childishly believe in Santa Claus—never fail to underestimate such costs by the most fantastic margins. The British cost of socialized medicine has turned out to be six times the original estimates. But Liberal candidates care nothing about costs. Their policy: 'After us, the deluge. We want to win. By the time the public finds out the costs of this program we'll be talking up some other free-for-nothing bait. Never look back. Always look forward.'

"But Alex, I'm concerned about whether people of your status—the leadership classes—see the terrible consequences of the vote-buying technique-thinking, not of this election only, but of the next 25 or 50 years.

"Liberals run for office on one simple program: whatever the opposition bids, we will raise. They want voters to believe that going after for-free money from Uncle Sam is a legitimate, moral, respected procedure. Once they have punched that hole in the dike, the rest is easy. Old people and their families will go to the polls with just one thought: which candidates promise us the most government money? Farmers and their families will go to the polls with just one thought: which candidates promise us the biggest government checks? All other groups, likewise. . . .

"Liberals know that a high percentage of Federal employees vote for the party which promises them the biggest pay raises. In many states, the number of Federal employees now far exceeds the combined total of municipal, county and state employees. The bigger the government, the greater the number of government employees.

"Once a society has been built around the voting test 'WHAT'S THERE IN IT FOR ME?' every citizen as a matter of self-preservation will be forced to forget all other political issues to see that he 'gets his share.'

"So the next question logically becomes: 'how can he be sure of getting his share?'

"Obviously, only by becoming a member of a pressure group powerful enough to say to political parties: 'Give us what we demand—OR ELSE.'

"To be certain of being able to intimidate political parties, each pressure group will have to be both militant and highly disciplined. Each economic interest must be able to say to those dependent upon it for their livelihood:

" 'No one may remain in our occupation or industry unless he gives unquestioning obedience to the organization fighting for our program. It isn't that we, your organization chiefs, want to be dictators. But you've got to recognize that we're in a war with all other pressure groups for government money. Only the strong will prevail. The groups who are weak at the polls, who allow their people to decide for themselves, will get the left-overs. They will be on the paying end, but unlike the solid-voting blocs, they will NOT be on the receiving end.'

"Such a program resembles Mussolini's fascism which Liberals claim to dislike. Huey Long said in a cynical moment: 'When fascism comes to America, it will come in the guise of anti-fascism.'

"The point is that the more crassly and crudely selfish your program, the more you must talk about it in terms of 'ideals.' You must follow the example of the thief, about to be caught, who points to somebody else and loudly shouts: 'Stop that thief.'

"A Fascist America—labelled a Liberal America—is what the Reuthers, the Eleanors, the Kennedys and the Humphreys want. A Fascist America is what the Communists want, knowing it will be fertile soil for Communist seeds.

"Alex, I don't think Your Candidate, the Great Liberal, really wants a Fascist America; but his insatiable ambition, his willingness to make any promise to get votes, makes him the perfect dupe for those who know where his program will take us."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Harvard Revisited

An Old Grad Balks at Giving the College Cheer

By SKEPTICUS

I AM ONE of an apparently tiny group of cantankerous odd-balls who failed to contribute to the $82 million Program for Harvard College. There is no satisfaction for me in this. I owe a great deal to Harvard College.

Dean Briggs set me straight for the rest of my life on the proper use of "should" and "would"; Taussig dinned into me some basic economic truths which the outgivings of his Keynesian successors have been unable to shake; "Copey" (Prof. Charles Townsend Copeland to you barbarians), with his brutal sarcasm, purged a lot of nonsense out of my reluctant adolescent libido. Irving Babbitt couldn't see me as a member of his course, but his brilliant analysis of frauds influenced the Harvard climate of that day. To continue this nostalgia is to break the heart of any vintage Harvard graduate. Indeed, if they hadn't already raised the $82 million I wouldn't be writing this piece. Even as things are, I shall probably write that check some day—unless they break out with something new up there in Cambridge to curdle the impulse.

A brief summary of the frustrations of a would-be cheerful giver begins in 1957 with the invitation to J. Robert Oppenheimer to give the William James lectures on philosophy and ethics. It was preposterous enough to invite Oppenheimer to lecture on any subject, although if Harvard had asked him to enlighten the students on some subject like "But For Me, We Might Have Blown Up a Faithful Ally," I wouldn't have been too concerned. But ethics hardly seemed the right subject for Oppenheimer. Assuming that this objection would appear at least rational to any educated man, whatever his attitude, I mentioned it to the alumnus assigned to give me the pitch for the Program. He never called on me again. "Unclean! Unclean!" was, I suppose, his verdict. The Harvard Corporation refused to discuss its decision, apparently going along with the Harvard Crimson that the students were lucky to "hear the thoughts of one of the greatest minds of the century."

One could live with a university which had helped clean up Oppenheimer, or even one which had shown an amazing degree of tolerance toward Fifth Amendment Professors. Harvard is determined not to "let moss-covered error moor her at its side while the world on truth's current glides by," and takes some curious measures to implement this attitude. After all, the Program for Harvard College didn't include anything for Dean Griswold's law school, with its built-in hostility to congressional investigations of "the right to think" which, of course, no committee has investigated anyway. If Harvard had let it go with Oppenheimer, a small donation wouldn't affront the conscience too deeply. That New England guilt complex has to have an outlet somewhere.

But then came the nomination of Ralph Bunche for the Board of Overseers and his triumphant election despite the able analysis of Bunche's career by Archibald Roosevelt ('17). *Such evidence of ignorance and smugness among the graduates of our greatest university was appalling, although it seems to have been motivated by the neo-abolitionism which caused some students to picket lunch rooms because Southern lunch rooms didn't want to go bankrupt for the sake of "integration." But the Bunche bobble was promptly followed by startling evidence of the degree to which this numbskull, State Street toying with liberalism, had trickled down into the student body.*

SENATOR JOE MCCARTHY has been dead two years now and, therefore, cannot be blamed for the assertion that, of Harvard students, "nearly a third believe that the Federal Government should own and operate all basic industries"; that "a clear-cut majority of the undergraduates polled support 'recognition of Communist China by the United States and its admission to the United Nations' "; that "four fifths support Federal aid to public secondary schools"; that only a minority favors such things as "marked reduction" in our mutual security program. This minority is the "Fortnightly Crowd—laughed at when they are not ignored."

No, "McCarthyism" didn't produce these statistics. They are taken from an account in the Harvard Crimson (student daily newspaper) for September 25, 1959, of a survey which has been carried on among students at the University by Prof. David Reisman of the Sociology Department. Nor did Harvard apologize for this strange state of affairs. On the contrary, the survey showed, according to Craig K. Comstock, who wrote the Crimson's story, that "for the most part the college's students did not arrive in Cambridge with these beliefs; they picked them up at Harvard. Over half admit that their political views have been strongly influenced since Freshman Registration and, of these, seven-tenths have changed either "from conservative to liberal" or from "liberal to more liberal."

How does this metamorphosis occur? According to Mr. Comstock, the decisive factors in the students' leftward shift are "lectures and assigned reading in courses." The popular introductory course in economics uses the textbook by Prof. Paul A. Samuelson of MIT which lays great stress on the Keynesian doctrine of "counter cyclical spending" to offset business slumps. It is not surprising, concludes the Crimson, that a third of Harvard's students favor "reduction of current unemployment by government action, even at the price of aggravated inflation."

Of course, we have no information as to where Dr. Reisman picked his samples. And there were countercurrents. For example, "over half favor 'right to work' laws"—although the Crimson kisses off these odd-balls as "probably influenced by the huge amount of anti-union propaganda distributed in the recent congressional campaign." Nevertheless, the McClellan committee's revelations seem to have disturbed some of "the hotbed of unconcern" which, according to the Crimson, is today's Harvard. From what professor did the young editor absorb the idea that the committee's revelations of the vicious abuse of power by labor unions is "anti-union propaganda?"

THIS SURVEY—plus another dealing with the attitudes of Harvard undergraduates on religion, sex and marriage—appeared in the Harvard Crimson during the struggle to persuade supposedly conservative Harvard men of substance to give generously to the old school. But as far as I know, not one Harvard alumnus, however rich and conservative, asked the question: "Does this survey actually reflect what Harvard students are being taught about the merits of the economic system which makes it possible for Harvard to exist as a free seat of learning?"

I don't insist that Finance should dictate to Scholarship what it should teach, but it doesn't seem unreasonable to suggest that some generous but inquisitive donor might inquire if it is true that an up-to-date university is actually encouraging students to regard favorably the old-hat and discredited notion that the government should own all the basic industries? Even the British Socialists are crawling out from under that one—but, one gathers, not Harvard. Before giving too much money to pay for education at Harvard, I would want at least a little more analysis of the figures in, and conclusions from, the Reisman questionnaire.

This manifestation of "Harvard Indifference" is puzzling, but there is much in the academic world to puzzle one, by no means altogether at Harvard. The Gadarene rush of the community of scholars to demand repeal of the so-

Copyright 1960 by HUMAN EVENTS

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

called "loyalty oath" by students receiving Federal scholarships under the National Defense Education Act is a sample of the ability of professors to work up a lather over the strangest things. Perhaps the loyalty oath is nothing to get emotionally wrought up about.

If students accepting money from the government are humiliated when asked to abstain from joining outfits pledged to destroy their own government, one can only marvel at the new morality. But the curious feature in all this fuss is that, while most of the dissenters have no objection to taking the oath of loyalty, they strenuously denounce the requirement that they state under oath that they do not "believe in" or belong to organizations dedicated to the overthrow of the government. Personally, I would waive "believe in" if that would make everybody happier, but "belong to" is important. Its importance is indicated by the objectors themselves, who explain blithely that "No Communist would hesitate to take a loyalty oath, whether he intended to keep it or not." But Presidents Pusey of Harvard, Griswold of Yale *et al* never add the corollary:

> **A Communist would certainly hesitate to state under oath that he belonged to no subversive organizations, if he suspected that the authorities knew he belonged to several! However debonairly Communists regard the sanctity of the oath, they are distinctly adverse to going to jail for perjury.**

The fact that this obvious reason for the disclaimer escapes so many college presidents, students and US Senators suggests that the Communist party, which would love to load the scholarship program with its boys, has operated its propaganda mill with extraordinary skill.

This phony battle for academic freedoom reminds me of a question raised by the English historian A. L. Rowse in an article in *Time and Tide* several years ago: "Why is it that so many intellectuals exhibit sheer silliness of judgment about public affairs, especially politics—to such a degree that they make themselves figures of contempt among ordinary sensible people who disregard what they say even when they happen to be right?"

Coincidentally, Mr. Rowse's observation on the silliness of intellectuals was provoked by a group of British eggheads who had demanded unilateral nuclear disarmament. Why, Mr. Rowse wanted to know, do these intellectuals "suppose that our leaders are not as disturbed as they are, are not just as much men of good will, as anxious to do what is right?" Well, intellectuals are still smugly at it. Just a few weeks ago 106 professors at Johns Hopkins University and Goucher College, including, of all people, Owen Lattimore, signed a telegram to Secretary of State Herter informing him that both his country and the USSR "have been too pre-occupied with their differences and not enough concerned with their common goals!" The telegram added that insistence on a perfect system of inspection would insure failure of the conference. They urged upon Mr. Herter the importance of accepting "considerable risks to achieve the goal of general disarmament . . . . "

Making every allowance for the tranquilizing effect of the Spirit of Camp David, an intellectual has to be pretty silly to let his name be found on a paper signed by Owen Lattimore. But the essence of silliness in this telegram is the reference to the "common goals" which the United States and the USSR are supposed to share. In a sense, it could be said that the Undertaker and the Corpse have a common goal in that the grave is the goal of both. Indeed that is the way Chairman Khrushchev feels about it. But 106 *American professors, certified as smart enough to instruct college students, consider it safe for this country to risk its survival in order to get Mr. Khrushchev's signature on another agreement, of which, if past performance means anything, he could not be expected to take a serious view!*

JOHNS HOPKINS AND GOUCHER need money as badly as Harvard does, and, fortunately for them, no rich donor has ventured to ask a civil question, much less to demand an investigation into higher education in this country in the hope of discovering what there is about eminence in the many branches of scholarship that produces such mush-headedness among its votaries. It ought to be possible to carry on such an inquiry without inhibiting the academic freedom of anybody. However, now that a professor, who perhaps superfluously urged his students to "sleep around" as a preparation for marriage, claims that firing him was a blow at academic freedom, the usual clamor would certainly arise. But there must be some connection between silliness of judgment on simple ethical questions and the competence of professors to teach their specialties. Well, perhaps that is putting it a little too strong; the Absent Minded Professor is a cherished American tradition. But why is the silliness of professors today so generally of a left-liberal pattern? Past generations have known professors seriously devoted to scholarly pursuits having little to do with current politics; but few of them were suckers for dubious causes. One wonders what would happen to a Keller returning to contemporary Yale, or a Babbitt to Harvard, or even a Woodrow Wilson to Princeton. These and other men of moderate or conservative views were respected leaders on their faculties. It is hard to imagine them today in the academic environment, unless in the role of Harvard's "Fortnightly crowd—laughed at when they are not ignored."

Perhaps this piece is too pessimistic. There are leavening influences here and there: William Yandell Elliott at Harvard, Rowe at Yale, Strauss-Hupe at Pennsylvania, Russell Kirk, Merrill Root, and others in other colleges throughout the country. Also there are the students, who, according to Victor Milione's Individualists, are Wearying of Socialism. Several students have told me they would be proud to take the "loyalty oath."

EVEN IF THIS PROMISING counter-revolution is no more than the traditional resistence of students to magisterial omniscience, it is a hopeful sign. For one thing, students get around more than they used to. A professor told me, after the war, of the astonishment of a boy at an Ivy League university when he discovered that one of his professors was an individual whom the student, as an intelligence soldier, had been assigned to "tail all over Japan"! That particular professor got the axe, but why was he hired in the first place? What was so appealing about Mark Zborowski, the Stalinist agent who put the finger on Trotsky in Paris, that Harvard had to pick him to teach anthropology? Yes, we all misjudge people; but why are the misjudgments so similar? Zborowski—could land jobs at Harvard and Columbia until the Feds. snatched him; but Dr. Felix Wittmer, a scholar unfortunate enough to be a moderate conservative—is teaching in a high school!

This is becoming tedious, even to me, but perhaps it indicates why, despite my love for the old school and despite my best wishes for its athletes, I am holding up that check to the Program for Harvard College until the crystal ball clears, and it is possible to learn whether Harvard really expects its loyal alumni to believe that education for a sort of half-hearted socialism is worth $82 million.

HUMAN EVENTS was founded in 1944 by Frank C. Hanighen. It is published weekly at 408 First Street, S. E., Washington 3, D. C., and reports from Washington on politics, business, labor and taxes. $12.50 per year.
TRIAL SUBSCRIPTION: 5 weeks $1.

ORDER BLANK

HUMAN EVENTS

408 First Street, S. E., Washington 3, D. C.

Send me _____ reprints of "HARVARD REVISITED" at $ _____

☐ Payment enclosed ☐ Bill me

Additional copies of this 2-page article: single copy 15c (coins not stamps); 15 copies $1; 35 copies $2; 125 copies $5; 300 copies $10; 1,000 copies $20. In 5,000 lots $15 per thousand. Unless otherwise ordered, reprints are sent by fourth-class mail, which takes ten days to two weeks for delivery. For first-class mail delivery of 2-page articles, add ½c per copy; for air-mail, add 2c per copy.

Enter my subscription

☐ 5 weeks for $1 ☐ 1 year for $12.50

Name _____

Street _____

City _____ Zone ____ State _____

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

HUMAN EVENTS
--- COMMENTARY

THE LIBRARY
WISCONSIN STATE COLLEGE
RIVER FALLS, WISCONSIN

The things that will destroy America are prosperity-at-any-price, peace-at-any-price, the love of soft living and the get-rich-quick theory of life.

THEODORE ROOSEVELT

Vol. XVII, No. 27 — Section V July 7, 1960

Unions Get Veto Power Over States

High Court Makes Shambles Of '58 Transportation Act

By Raymond Moley

One of the most disturbing decisions of our divided Supreme Court in recent years was one handed down last April. It could have pervasive and deleterious effects upon our system of enterprise.

The case had to do with a railroad's and a union's rights and responsibilities in what would appear to be the function of increasing the efficiency and solvency of the road in the public interest. In 1956, the Chicago and North Western Railway encountered severe financial troubles. The road had not been maintained properly. Inefficient and wasteful practices had not been eliminated. A new management, seeking to improve the road's position, included in its streamlining program a plan to discontinue many "one-man" stations and to establish a Central Agency Plan whereby an agent could perform the necessary services of several stations.

North Western turned to the proper authority—the Public Utility Commissions of states in which it served. This procedure is in accord with the Interstate Commerce Act and was reaffirmed by the Transportation Act of 1958 in which Congress clearly told the railroads to go to the states (not to the unions) before abandoning or consolidating local stations. In 1958 the South Dakota Commission, after finding that the workload of agents at 69 stations averaged less than an hour a day, directed North Western to make its plan effective immediately.

However, the railway union involved—the Order of Railroad Telegraphers—served notice on the management that it must bargain on a provision that no jobs could be abolished except by agreement. The alternative: a strike. The railroad proposed to negotiate with the union as to severance pay and other matters concerning those agents who would be displaced. The union refused, reiterating that if North Western refused to "comply" with the union's demand, it would suffer a strike.

North Western brought suit, and eventually the Court of Appeals found that acceptance of the union demand could not legally be forced by a strike. In April, the Supreme Court reversed this decision.

Four Justices dissented strongly, bringing out overwhelming evidence of congressional intent which supports the railroad's position and previous Court decisions supporting the ruling of the Court of Appeals. Justice Whittaker's dissent points out that "for all practical purposes the Court is telling the railroad that it must secure the union's approval before severing the hundreds of surplus employees now carried on its payroll. Everyone knows what the answer of the union will be."

IN THE WRONG GRIP

Whittaker notes further that the Court "gives to the union a veto power over" a legal action of the states, and goes on to say, "Certainly that demand runs in the teeth of the recited provisions and policies of the Interstate Commerce Act. It plainly would destroy the public regulation of abandonments, provided and contemplated by Congress in the public interest, and render them subject to the unions' will alone. A demand for such a contractual power surely is an unlawful demand."

A little imagination opens up a fantastic economic prospect if such power is delivered into the hands of our union hierarchy. American enterprise everywhere grapples with energetic competition. Greater production, automation, and a very high degree of efficiency are indispensable to future prosperity. To hamper, to check, to frustrate these developments can work only to the detriment of a vast majority, including most union men. Although Congress may have every reason to feel that it had made itself unmistakably clear on the points at issue in the Telegraphers *v.* Chicago & North Western case, it may have to spend valuable time to spell out again its intent for the benefit of five men on the Supreme Court.

Copyright 1960 by HUMAN EVENTS

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

HumphreyOK's Political Payola

From the Economic Intelligence

How to operate a representative form of government without "political payola" is a major conundrum.

In arguing for the Forand health insurance program, Senator Hubert Humphrey publicly urged his colleagues to get behind the bill on the ground that this is "political insurance" of their election to, or continuity in, office. This is about as crass an appeal as one can find. The late H. L. Mencken once said that if politicians found that they had cannibals among their constituents, they would promise them missionaries for their Sunday dinners. Perhaps, a bit harsh, but it does point up the problem.

Congressman Halleck, in describing the avalanche of multi-billion dollar spending bills, referred to them as "political payola." He said they "simply hand out the taxpayer's money to buy votes for the next election."

Should a Congressman who is a wheat farmer vote on a wheat program placing a financial burden on taxpayers? The same goes for tobacco, cotton and others. If he owns shares in a railroad or an airline, should he conscientiously abstain from participation in a vote which involves subsidies to such carriers?

We would be shocked if a judge presided over a lawsuit in which his own personal decision determined his economic loss or gain. It is conceivable that one day our legislative representatives will develop a similar integrity, honesty and forthrightness. But for most of them that day is not yet at hand.

It seems somewhat incongruous for a congressman to pass judgment on payola in radio or TV and yet have him, week after week, not hesitate to participate in decision-making which lines his own pocket or which merely serves his Potomac fever ego and keeps him on the public payroll.

Uncle Sam Forfeits Millions For the Cause of Socialism

From the Richmond News Leader

Some years ago, during the administration of Mr. Truman, proponents of public power launched a vigorous campaign for development of the Roanoke River. The idea was to build a whole series of hydroelectric projects, not only at Buggs Island but all up and down the river. This was to be a small-scale TVA.

Private power companies in Virginia and North Carolina fought out the issue through the years of hard politics and prolonged litigation. In the end, the government built the Kerr Dam at Buggs Island, and the Virginia Electric & Power Company built its own dam at Roanoke Rapids. Not long ago, Vepco won permission to build still another dam at Gaston.

Out of curiosity, we inquired the other day what the effect of all this has been on the revenues of government. The figures provide a short, classic lesson in the difference between socialism, at Buggs Island, and old-fashioned capitalism, at Roanoke Rapids and Gaston.

The American taxpayers had to provide the $73 million that went into public power portions of the Kerr Dam. If the Kerr Dam paid local real estate and personal property taxes, which it does not, it would contribute $336,000 annually toward the costs of local government. If the Kerr Dam paid other taxes on its power output, which it does not, it would provide another $1,196,000 annually in governmental revenues.

Meanwhile Vepco raised its own capital in the open market. At Roanoke Rapids, the company now pays $220,000 a year in real estate and personal property taxes, plus another $1,059,000 every year in income taxes and other levies. When the Gaston dam is complete, in 1963, Vepco will pay $258,000 in local taxes and $1,139,000 annually in other taxes resulting from the power output.

Yes, power from Buggs Island is "cheaper" than power from Roanoke Rapids or Gaston. But the State and local government, and the structure of an incentive society, are the poorer because of it.

Goldwater Book

Senator Goldwater's new book *Conscience of a Conservative* was published in a 50c paperbound edition July 1 and is being sold on 10,000 newsstands. Nearly 70,000 hardcover $3 editions have been sold since its publication date April 15th. This is a far larger sale than that of many of the books shown on the best seller lists carried by the New York *Times*, New York *Herald-Tribune*, and *Saturday Review*.

Will Social Legislation Bring Slavery Again?

From the Indianapolis Star

One of the nation's leading spokesmen for "social legislation" defined its chief points recently. He said that the goals of any social security system should provide for adequate retirement; protection against loss of work; medical care for disabled workers; care of dependent children and wives, and burial and death benefits to survivors.

That's odd. The South had the same system at one time, except that it was called slavery and the nation fought a war to abolish its evils.

Shakespeare was right when he asked, "What's in a name?"

Government Controls Just Grow and Grow

By Congressman Gerald Ford

The US Code, a compilation of Federal statutes, was first published in 1926. *The original edition was composed of ONE volume* which contained all the Federal laws in effect at that time. *In* 1946 *it required FOUR volumes* to summarize federal law. But the most recent edition of the US Code (1958) *is composed of TEN volumes.* To bring this edition up to date the First Supplement has gone to press .... Today, therefore, *it requires eleven volumes, averaging* 900 *pages each,* to compile the Federal statutes. This is nearly a 1000 per cent increase over 1926 and is illustrative of the increased control exercised by Washington over the lives and fortunes of each citizen.

Federal health insurance for senior citizens would be just a start at trickling the "free handouts" down the age scale.

In High School

Scholastic Achievement Suffers When Students Acquire Autos

From the Chicago Tribune

The Purdue Opinion panel, which studies what goes on in the minds of teen-agers, reports that if the average teen-ager were to have what he wanted most, it would be an automobile—preferably a convertible.

We wish we could welcome this as evidence that today's youth is eager to study applied mechanics, metallurgy, the effect of friction on natural and synthetic rubber, and the relative merits of different fuels. But such optimism would be hard to justify. Only recently, a Chicago insurance company reported that the average high school boy's grades start downhill the moment he acquires a car, and that the more he uses the car, the faster they go down.

There doesn't seem to be any easy way to reverse this trend, short of another depression or an increase in the minimum driving age. But there is one consolation. In its report for 1959, the Citizens Traffic Safety Board of Chicago shows that although the total number of drivers involved in accidents increased 14 per cent over the previous 10 year average, there was virtually no increase in the under 20 age group. There were sharp increases in all age groups over 35.

Maybe this means that although the teen-ager's automobile spells doom for his studies, it is at least teaching him to improve the driving habits which have caused his reputation as a motorist to go down and his insurance rates to go up.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

US Pays Bonus To Its Debtors

From the Houston Chronicle

Senator John J. Williams (R.-Del.) gave his colleagues an eye-opening lesson in arithmetic recently to show that the United States has loans out to other nations of the world totalling approximately $1,500,000,000 and that instead of collecting a profit to the Treasury on these loans we are actually paying a premium to the borrower nations. This condition exists, he said, because through various lending agencies we have approved loans at 2½ per cent interest to nations which already hold United States securities pegged at 4¼ per cent interest. The difference in interest rate is the profit to the foreign nation.

And to demonstrate how this procedure runs into huge costs to the harried American taxpayer, Senator Williams cited statistics on our dealings in this respect with two nations—Italy and Britain. Italy borrowed $95,600,000 at 2½ per cent calling for annual interest of $2,390,000. But Italy holds $1,224,000,000 in 4¼ per cent United States securities which pay $52,020,000 annual interest—a difference of $49,630,000 in favor of Italy. Britain owes us $384,800,000 at 2½ per cent on which we draw $9,620,000 annually while paying Britain $29,025,500 annually on $655,000,000 of our securities held by the British government.

Williams said these are but samples and named France, West Germany, the Netherlands and Sweden among other nations enjoying the advantages of this tangled financial irregularity. He flatly asserted many nations are using foreign aid loans to buy United States government bonds. These are not facts hidden from those high in government. Williams obtained his figures from the Treasury. Certainly there should be some controls over these loans which would prohibit the United States from paying a premium to extend them. One does not need be a banker to see this.

Ice Folly Becomes African Boondoggle

From the Nashville Banner

In an effort to win "respect for the United States and its achievements in the performing arts," the State Department is sending an ice show to deepest, darkest Africa.

And if the show isn't too "hot," the department believes the natives will be impressed by the ice—or ice water—since the temperatures at some of the ports of call will reach the 120-mark.

It has been estimated that the show will fall $95,000 short of making expenses. This same group lost $60,000 on a Russian trip last year and ice is easier to come by there than in the Sahara.

This no doubt is the "Ice Folly of 1960."

Now We're Importing Wheat!

From the Duluth Publicity

Every time we think we've heard all that's wrong with the farm program along comes another item.

We have enough surplus wheat on hand to make a pancake that would blanket the Middle West, and yet it turns out that we're having to import wheat. And this at a time when the unfavorable balance of trade is causing government leaders sleepless nights.

Why are we importing wheat? Well, it seems that the Government support program doesn't distinguish much between varieties of wheat. A portion of hard winter wheat is needed to make quality flour. But the supports system, together with special payments for plowing your land and letting it lie fallow through the summer months, have caused a shortage of winter wheat grown in the US.

Despite all the demonstrations of the staggering cost and gross bumbling that is bound to occur under a rigid Government farm program, there's a bill before Congress now to increase the controls. It's the family farm income bill, and it should be declared surplus and stored away without further ado.

No Matter Who Wins in November, Bureaucrats Will Shape Our Fate

By Walter Trohan

Democrats and Republicans in Congress would like to see more political responsibility in the executive branch of the government, but hesitate to sponsor a proposal advanced by former President Hoover because they fear they would be accused of trying to re-establish the spoils system.

Hoover proposed that there be about 2,000 top policy making positions throughout the executive department filled by political appointment. These would replace only about one-tenth of one per cent of the civil service jobs, but would direct the activities of career personnel.

"Political parties come into power with a mandate as to policies which the majority of the people wish established," the former President says in explaining his suggestion. "There are not enough policy making positions today subject to party choice to carry out these mandates."

When President Eisenhower was inaugurated January 20, 1953, he found that he had only a handful of appointments he could make although he had promised marked changes in government policy during his campaign. Republicans began complaining that the party was being prevented from carrying out its programs because Democrats had been wired into key federal positions under civil service. President Roosevelt had brought into the protective tent of the merit system many Democrats whose jobs had previously been patronage plums.

Democrats laughed at these Republican charges, but now they have come to see that a corps of career political appointees would strengthen the party system. It would give young men something to look forward to as a reward for party service and it would provide a well of talent for various elective offices.

Both parties are finding that they have created a bureaucratic hierarchy, which is running the government pretty much in its own way without regard to either party. Some of these bureaucrats are inclined to look pityingly on elective officials somewhat as many might look at show girls—persons with political sex appeal but intellectually dumb.

The patronizing attitude, perhaps most common in the state department, has infuriated members of Congress more than anything except losing votes. Yet, although they recognize the wisdom of the former President in advancing the suggestion, they hesitate to move to correct the situation, because opponents would blast them as seeking to reintroduce the spoils system.

'Liquid' Diplomacy?

From the Indianapolis News

It takes a lot of tax dough to keep the wheels of international diplomacy "well oiled."

The State Department's budget has earmarked $835,000 for entertainment and liquor. Various international missions and organizations of this government will draw $335,000 for the same purposes.

The State Department also needs $200,000 to equip a small hospitality room in its new $55 million annex.

Evidently the striped-pants corps feels it must entertain lavishly in order to get the foreign brass and braid to accept our foreign aid dollars.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Late Steel Settlement Item Gave Unions Powerful Whip

By Victor Riesel

ALL OVER WASHINGTON it was 9 a. m. Monday, January 4—except in that locked room where the duelists in steel were now down to what might be described as hand-to-hand fighting. In that room it was the 11th hour. We had all been told that the steel strike was over for some seven hours. It wasn't, it now develops. At the last moment the pact might have been junked.

The union strategists had one more demand. The steel industry's iron-nerved bargainer, Conrad Cooper, had to take it or leave it—fast. Without it, there would be no pact. Cooper had bucked it for months and months. He had said it nauseated him to think of it. But now there were just a few minutes left. The union spokesman, counsel Art Goldberg, had a plane standing by. He was due in a Pittsburgh court at 10 a. m. He was already late.

Goldberg Stayed

If he left, negotiations might not have been resumed for weeks. There would have been an industrial and political crisis. US Steel Corp., the biggest of them all, yielded. Goldberg stayed.

History has been made. The industry had agreed to something called the agency shop.

THIS WILL SET a trend for '60—and thereafter. Under the agency shop, workers in a plant who refuse to join the union pay a service charge to the labor organization. The union argument is that all workers in a plant benefit from union organization. Therefore there should be "no free ride." The union services them. So they should pay a service charge. In steel it will be five dollars a month, the same as the union's monthly dues.

Monthly Service Charge

Dave McDonald and Arthur Goldberg asked for the agency shop in all Indiana plants. In that state a comparatively new law bans the union shop as well as the closed shop. Indiana has some of the land's greatest steel mills. Loss of union dues and membership there could hurt the United Steel Workers. So the union made one of its demands the deduction of a monthly service charge from the pay of non-union workers. This has been ruled legal by the Indiana courts.

Though virtually unknown, the agency shop has been around since 1946. It sprang from an arbitration award in a case involving the Ford Motor Co. of Canada. It filtered down slowly. Now some 1% of the nation's 125,000 labor contracts have it.

Western Union

BIGGEST OF THE companies taking a service charge out of their employes' pay for the unions is the Western Union Co. It is also included in the contracts of the West Coast waterfront firms hiring longshoremen, the Corn Products Refining Co., and some hotels belonging to the Miami Beach Hotel Assn.

Though courts in some states have held it illegal, the service charge now will spread—especially into those states covered by the "Right-to-Work Laws." These laws prohibit dues check-off and labor contracts which require workers to become union members.

Bigger Severance Pay

While the agency shop will be the most novel and dramatic demand, it won't overshadow drives for bigger severance pay. Only one out of every three workers is now covered in this fashion. Watch, too, for demands by the Auto Workers, led by Walter Reuther; the Machinists, led by Al Hayes; and the electrical appliance workers, led by Jim Carey, for "job security."

THIS WILL BE IN the form of a drive against cutting "crew sizes" or layoffs coming from the introduction of "thinking machinery" and "modernization." Unions also will ask for special funds to pay workers for two or three years after they've been displaced by a pushbutton, and for training and shifting of workers from one section of the country to another where jobs are available.

Permanent Unemployment Insurance

There is a drive just about picking up speed for permanent unemployment insurance—the worker to be paid by a federal-state fund from the time of layoff until he gets a new job.

Oh yes, there will be wage increases. The next hike will range between $3.50 and $4 a week. Time spirals on.

Businessmen Defy Castro

From the New York Daily News

Cuban dictator Fidel Castro recently ordered US and British oil companies operating in his domain to refine the Soviet crude oil which Castro imports in exchange for sugar.

Two US companies and one British —Standard of New Jersey, Texas, Shell —are defying the Castro order. They get their crude from Venezuela, and refuse to break their Venezuelan contract.

What this refusal will lead to is anybody's guess. It looks as if Castro can and will freeze these companies out of Cuba, take over their properties, and thereafter refine any oil he pleases—assuming he can find enough Cubans able to run the refineries.

Whatever happens, we admire the courage of these companies in telling this Red to go climb a tree; and we have a hunch that their courage somehow will pay off better in the long run than would a cowardly surrender to Castro.

FDR Lives in Yalta

From the New York Daily News

Yalta, the Soviet city where then-President Franklin D. Roosevelt cheerfully sold East Europe and all of China down the river to good old Joe Stalin in 1945, has just named a central street after its benefactor.

Same time, Red-lining Fidel Castro has angrily rechristened all Havana streets bearing US names. Congratulations, Ike.

New Book on Sacco-Vanzetti Case Will Correct the 'Liberal' Legend

From Advance Book News by Devin-Adair

In a year which will see Sacco and Vanzetti brought to life in an operetta, a play, and in books, Devin-Adair will publish, in September, *Sacco-Vanzetti: The Murder and the Myth* by Robert H. Montgomery, member of the Boston Bar.

Mr. Montgomery, considered one of the foremost legal minds in Massachusetts, knew many of the principals in the 1921 trial and the final review in 1927. He has devoted years to a study of the evidence, and in his book he points to these conclusions, based on the facts of the case:

That Sacco and Vanzetti were guilty of murder as charged and were properly convicted by a jury of their peers;

That the conviction was based solely on evidence unfolded in the course of a fair trial;

That judge and jury were untouched by the war of the ideologies which was waged around the world on behalf of the accused but which did not figure in the trial;

That subsequent reviews by Governor Fuller and the Advisory Committee were fair and exhaustive;

That the reputations of good men were ruined by Sacco and Vanzetti supporters in their zeal to uphold "civil liberties";

That bribery, blackmail, and intimidation were used by defense attorneys who finally were obliged to withdraw from the case;

That proved facts of the case have been distorted and suppressed by Felix Frankfurter, Arthur Schlesinger Jr., and other "mythmakers."

Sacco-Vanzetti: The Murder and the Myth will be published as an objective effort to set the record straight.

Two other books soon to be published by Devin-Adair are *Red Star Over Cuba*, by Nathaniel Weyl, and *Who Killed Bang-Jensen*, by Peter Copp.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED